DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 579 CS 502 461

AUTHOR Hecht, Michael L.
TITLE Contextual Correlates of Communication Satisfaction.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (64th, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 2-5, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Perception; Social Relations; Time Perspective
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research; *Communication Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

To examine the effects of the contextual variables of relationship intimacy and time on communication satisfaction, a study was undertaken involving 252 college freshmen. The subjects participated in one of two treatments. In the first, they were randomly paired and participated in social conversation for 15 minutes. Following the conversation, they rated their communication satisfaction and their perceptions of relationship intimacy with each other. In the second, the subjects recalled either a recent satisfying or dissatisfying social conversation and also rated their perceived communication satisfaction and perceived relationship intimacy. A self-report instrument was used to measure communication satisfaction, and a checklist on which subjects indicated their perceptions of the other party in the conversation as a friend, acquaintance, or stranger was used to measure relationship intimacy. The results showed that communication satisfaction among friends was characterized by interaction management. It was also determined that when satisfaction was measured immediately, the process of communication emerged as an important determinant; however, for recalled conversations, one's intentions prior to the interaction and one's feelings of being understood afterward emerged. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169579

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONTEXTUAL CORRELATES OF COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION

Michael L. Hecht
Department of Speech Communication
California State University, Northridge
Northridge, CA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael L. Hecht

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TOP FIVE PLUS CRITICS PROGRAM
INTERPERSONAL AND SMALL GROUP INTERACTION DIVISION
SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
November, 1978
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

CS502461

Abstract

CONTEXTUAL CORRELATES OF COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION

This study reports the effects of contextual influences on communication satisfaction. The first contextual variable, relationship intimacy, was operationalized by having respondents indicate their perceptions of the other on a friend, acquaintance and stranger checklist. Time frame was operationalized by two treatments. The first asked respondents to interact in a classroom setting and the second asked respondents to recall satisfying and dissatisfying conversations. The communication determinants of satisfaction were operationalized by a 60-item self-report instrument. Statistical analyses indicated that satisfaction with communication among friends is characterized by signs of intimacy while satisfaction with communication among acquaintances is characterized by interaction management. Friends were also found to be more satisfied. Further, it was found that when satisfaction is measured immediately the process of communication emerges as an important determinant, while for recalled conversations one's intentions prior to the interaction and one's feelings of being understood afterward emerge. Finally, four context-specific measures of satisfaction were created and exhibited high degrees of reliability.

Contextual Correlates of Communication Satisfaction

The identification of satisfying communication behaviors provides a means for explicating the notion of effectiveness or competence. Effectiveness means achieving desirable outcomes and positive affects or emotions such as satisfaction constitute some of these outcomes. The identification of satisfying communication behaviors, however, is only meaningful within contextual parameters due to the transactional nature of communication. This study, therefore, seeks to specify communication behaviors associated with satisfaction within contextual parameters.

The affective realm provides a repertoire of criteria for assessing communication effectiveness. In some situations, effective communication should make us feel good. These positive feelings are the goals of some interactions and the complementary outcome of the attainment of other goals. Emotions have also been empirically related to other effects. Cross lag correlational analysis seems to indicate, for example, that extrinsic satisfaction is causally related to organizational performence.[1] The importance of the evaluative dimension of semantic space[2] and the myriad implications of affective variables such as anxiety[3] and attraction[4] also provide support for the notion of affective criteria for the assessment of communication effectiveness.

While any number of positive affective outcomes may be specified as a criterion, satisfaction is particularly relevant to the explication of communication effectiveness. On the most general level, it is probably the most guaranteed commodity on the American marketplace; satisfaction guaranteed is an advertising cliche. In addition to its everyday

prominance, psychologists maintain that we feel satisfied when we are mentally healthy[5] or have experienced a successful interaction.[6] Satisfaction with relationships has been found to be significantly related to relationship intimacy.[7]

More specifically, satisfaction also helps explicate communication effectiveness because it is derived from a process analogous to goal-attainment, one of the keys to effectiveness.[8] Conceptually, satisfaction has been defined as an affect linked to the environmental reinforcement of behaviors associated with discriminative stimuli.[9] In other words, discriminative stimuli lead to the manifestation of certain behaviors. If these behaviors are reinforced, the reinforcement becomes paired with the link between the discrimination and the behaviors. The pairing gives rise to an affect: satisfaction. Communication satisfaction is experienced when reinforcement follows communication produced in response to discriminative stimuli. The ability to make revelant discriminations and manifest behaviors which are reinforced is the key to both satisfaction and goal attainment.

Communication satisfaction, then, provides a useful criterion for effectiveness due to its everyday usage, psychological health value and revelance to goal attainment. At its inception as a communication construct, the study of satisfaction must proceed from a clear conceptual basis and firm descriptive roots. The conceptual definition summarized above and elaborated elsewhere[10] provides a framework for such description. This descriptive component involves the measurement of satisfaction and the specification of the process by which satisfaction is experienced. Based on the conceptual definition this process is seen as consisting of discriminative stimuli, behaviors and reinforcement.

DISCRIMINATIVE STIMULI

The role of discriminative stimuli in human behavior has received a great deal of recent theoretical attention. Discriminations are seen as the initiating event in the process of inner speech. This process forms the core of Meichenbaum's Theory of Cognitive-Behavior Modification.[11] Miller and Steinberg utilized the discrimination process to distinguish between noninterpersonal and interpersonal communication; a distinction around which their theory of communication is elaborated.[12] The discrimination process, then, is central to developing theories of both interpersonal and communication behavior.

Discriminative stimuli in communication are manifested from two sources: the context and the exchange of messages. The dichotomization of content and context factors appears repeatedly throughout the spectrum of behavioral sciences[13] and while the content (exchange process) is of great theoretical importance, the role of context has also been stressed within a number of competing theoretical paradigms. Theorists operating from Behavioral,[14] General Systems,[15] and Cognitivist[16] approaches have asserted that human interaction is by nature context bound. Rhetorical,[17] Behavioristic,[18] Humanistic[19] and Rules[20] perspectives are united in their emphasis on the context-bound nature of communication effectiveness. As Bochner noted, "Humans use context as a guide for discriminating among alternative interpretations of a situation and for deciding what responses are appropriate."[21] Similarly, Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson claimed that "context . . . always determines the contingencies to some extent."[22] Contectual discriminative stimuli are, therefore, of great theoretical

importance and of particular importance to the study of communication satisfaction.

There exists ample empirical evidence of the effect of context on message-related behaviors. Heath[23] found that values differed with situations and Rubin[24] demonstrated that questions are used differently in ambiguous and unambiguous contexts. Although Delia, Crockett, Press and O'Keefe[25] and Norwig[26] differed in their theoretical conclusions, both studies reported that context influenced interpersonal evaluation. In general, situation by person interactions seem to account for a greater percentage of the variance than any variables separately.[27] Contextual variables, then, account for a significant proportion of interaction variance and provide salient discriminative stimuli.

Contextual variables also provide salient parameters for the measurement of the satisfaction construct. Bochner concluded that the nature of some communication variables necessitates context-specific measurement.[28] The role of discriminative stimuli in the satisfaction process suggests the utility of context-specific measurement.

Contextual variables, then, play a central role in communication theory and research. Bochner maintained that no analysis of interpersonal behavior could be complete without consideration of the context.[29] The present study is one in a series designed to identify those contextual discriminative stimuli with the greatest impact on communication satisfaction. The relationship between communication satisfaction and communication effectiveness suggests that those variables of empirical and theoretical importance in general communication theory should be of equal importance for satisfaction. In his review of interpersonal communication

Bochner asserted that empirical research should begin by examining relational contextual cues.[30]

Relationship Intimacy

Relationship intimacy is a contextual variable which should figure prominently in any investigation of communication outcomes. On a theoretical level, it appears likely that various levels of intimacy engender different rule systems, expectations, and repertoires of appropriate behaviors. Pearce,[31] for example, maintained that the impact of relational and content dimensions of messages are mediated by relationship considerations. Keiser and Altman[32] reported that friends exhibited relaxed nonverbal behaviors while communicating about nonintimate topics and casual acquaintances were characteristically tense when talking about intimate topics. Phillips[33] stressed the amount of interaction and adaptation necessary to maintain a rewarding, intimate relationship. Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson[34] hypothesized that friendship and stranger relationships differed in the degree of redundancy or patterns and therefore systemic qualities. One may conclude, therefore, that intimacy cues may be important determinants of the dimensions used to evaluate communication outcomes. Garrison, Sullivan and Page[35] reported that relational satisfaction was an important predictor of intimacy. Since communication is seen as a key process in achieving satisfying relationships,[36] one may hypothesize that the dimensions used to access one's communication satisfaction will be at least in part determined by the contextual cues derived from the perceived level of relationship intimacy. These theoretical and empirical distinctions also lead to the

conclusion that relationship intimacy has implications for measure construction.

Time Frame

The time frame surrounding the perception of the interaction is a contextual cue with both methodological and theoretical implications. In this study time frame denotes the immediacy of one's evaluation of a conversation; whether the evaluation is made immediately following the interaction or some time later. The primacy-recency research in the persuasion field[37] suggests that time frame is an important variable. One might, therefore, expect the dimensions used to assess communication satisfaction to differ for evaluations of conversations which have just occurred and those which lie further in the past. This may be attributable to primacy-recency effects and/or a bias towards the recall of positive events. The latter criticism was raised by House and Wigdor[38] in response to Herzberg's critical incidents approach to the measurement of organizational satisfaction.[39] Further research indicated that there were problems associated with the methodology[40] without specifying how time frame influenced the dimensionality of satisfaction.

COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS AND REINFORCERS

A previous step in the current research program generated a pool of discriminative stimuli, behaviors and reinforcers salient to the experience of communication satisfaction.[41] This pool, called the communication correlates of satisfaction, was generated from a literature review, interviews and questionnaires, and proved capable of differentiating satisfying and dissatisfying conversations. The utility of the pool is

twofold. First, utilization of the behaviors provides the basis for participant observation (self-report) and nonparticipant observation (raters or judges) measurement of communication satisfaction. Previous research indicates that descriptive items create more reliable and valid satisfaction measures.[42]

Second, the pool provides the basis for observing the effects of different discriminations. The behaviors and reinforcers associated with each type of discriminative stimuli describe the communication process associated with satisfaction and, therefore, constitute a context-based repertoire of effective communication behaviors. The pool, then, provides a measure of total satisfaction when perceptions are summed across all items. However, individual items provide a measure of the communication behaviors most commonly associated with satisfaction. This twofold utility provides the basis for the present study.

This study, then, was designed to examine the effects of two contextual variables on the communication determinants and measurement of satisfaction. Level of relationship intimacy and time frame were chosen as the contextual variables and the following research questions were posed:

1. Do the communication determinants of satisfaction differ across various levels of relationship intimacy and time frame?
2. Do relationship intimacy and time frame affect the total amount of communication satisfaction?
3. Can reliable and valid context-specific measures of communication satisfaction be constructed?

METHODS

Respondents and Procedures

Respondents were 252 volunteers from the introductory communication course at the University of Illinois. Due to curricula requirements, students in this course are representative of all freshmen enrolled at the University. Respondents participated in one of two treatments operationalizing the time frame variable. Respondents were assigned to treatments in intact class units due to procedural necessity. Treatments were randomly assigned to groups.

In the first treatment respondents were randomly paired in dyads and asked to converse socially about a topic unrelated to the class. At the end of 15 minutes the conversations were stopped and participants rated their perceived communication satisfaction and their perceptions of the intimacy of their relationship with the other.

The second treatment required respondents to recall either a satisfying or dissatisfying conversation (randomly assigned) they had had in the recent past in a social situation. A social situation was defined as one in which the respondent took part in an interaction for the enjoyment of the conversation. Gaining information for later use, job functions, and classroom-related interactions were specifically excluded by the description. The definition conformed to the dimensions McHugh[43] hypothesized that people use to perceive social situations and matched the situation used to operationalize the immediate rating treatment. After recalling a recent conversation, respondents rated their perceived communication satisfaction and the perceived intimacy of their relationship with the other.

Measures

The communication determinants of satisfaction were operationalized by a self-report measure consisting of 60 Likert-type items developed in conjunction with the construction of the general communication satisfaction inventory.[44] Items were generated from previous research, responses to two types of questionnaires, and face-to-face interviews. They were constructed to conform to the discriminative fulfillment conceptualization of satisfaction which defines satisfaction as the affect experienced in concert with the reinforcement of behaviors associated with discriminative stimuli.[45] Consistent with previous satisfaction measurement,[46] most of the items were written to describe the environment. Items were tested to insure their ability to discriminate between ideal notions of truly satisfying and truly dissatisfying conversations. For greater detail concerning initial item construction, the reader is referred to the original study.[47]

The level of relationship intimacy was established by asking respondents to indicate whether they perceived the other to be a friend, acquaintance, or someone they did not know before the conversation. Davis provided a definition of each of these levels, but noted that the definitions were derived from "that which most people in a particular society consider to be intimate behavior."[48] The present operationalization, then, is based on the belief that people utilize implicit theories for categorizing others based on relationship intimacy.

Research Question One

Research question number 1 concerned the communication determinants of satisfaction which differentiate levels of relationship intimacy and time

frame of measurement. This question was examined by means of stepwise multiple discriminant analysis procedures. Page and McLaughlin[49] and Tatsuoka[50] provide cogent arguments for the use of multiple discriminant analysis procedures to compare the profiles of two groups. SPSS subprogram DISCRIMINANT[51] was utilized and the confidence level for X^2 values associated with Wilks' lambda was set at .05 for the evaluation of discriminant functions. For both analyses the total sample size was more than twice the number of variables (60) and in each case the smallest group was greater than the number of variables. Tatsuoka indicated that samples of this size are necessary in order to insure the validity of the test statistic.[52] To interpret group differences Tatsuoka recommended the identification of all standardized discriminant function coefficients greater than or equal to one-half of the value of the largest such coefficient.[53]

Following a step-wise multiple discriminant analysis of the intimacy data, a linear combination of 26 of the communication satisfaction variables was derived which produced significant between-group differences (Wilks' lambda = .529; X^2 = 126.09; $p < .001$). The eigenvalue associated with the discriminant function was .89; the canonical correlation was .80. Discriminant power (R^2), therefore, was .47. Group membership (friend versus acquaintance) was correctly identified in 83% of the cases. Table 1 presents the standardized discriminant function coefficients.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Fifteen variables were identified by weights greater than or equal to one-half the largest weight in the analysis. Interactions with friends were described as exhibiting greater satisfaction with the following variables: 6 (the other's signs of listening), 23 (physical comfort), 41 (laughing

easily together), 54 (receiving compliments), 55 (topic interest), and 57 (voluntary contact). Interactions with acquaintances were described as exhibiting greater satisfaction with these variables: 2 (perfunctory responses), 5 (tangential responses), 22 (presentation of self). 27 (general satisfaction), 28 (conversation termination), 34 (shared topic involvement), 43 (interruptions), 47 (elaboration requests), and 60 (disclosiveness).

A step-wise multiple discriminant analysis of the time frame data was also performed. A linear combination of 21 variables produced significant between-group differences (Wilks' lambda - .499; $X^2 = 166.466$; $p < .001$); the eigenvalue associated with the discriminant function was 1.00; the canonical correlation was .708. The discriminant power was .50. Group membership (immediate versus recalled rating) was correctly identified in 85% of the cases. Table 2 presents the standardized discriminant function coefficients.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The largest coefficient was .33 (rounded). Twelve other variables achieved coefficients at least one-half this value. Ratings which were completed immediately following the interaction were identified as exhibiting greater satisfaction with the following variables: 5 (tangential responses), 9 (disclosiveness), 19 (general satisfaction), 30 (annoying persistence), 39 (perspective taking), 43 (interruptions), and 59 (adjustment). Ratings of recalled conversations placed greater emphasis on these variables: 10 (understanding), 25 (being understood), 50 (interaction management), 54 (receiving compliments), and 57 (voluntary contact).

Research Question Two

Research question number 2 addressed the effects of time frame and intimacy on the total amount of satisfaction experienced. This question

was tested by means of a 2 x 2 analysis of variance. SPSS subprogram ANOVA[54] was utilized with the option which insured that each main and interaction effect would be tested with every other effect acting as a covariate. This partialling or covariate model was dictated by the manipulation of the time frame variable which precludes a straightforward examination of the main effect for that variable. Table 3 reports the results of the ANOVA.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

A significant main effect was reported for the intimacy and time frame variables, with effect sizes of .20 and .11 respectively. The analysis indicated that friends experience more communication satisfaction than acquaintances and that conversations rated immediately are more satisfying than those which are recalled. A significant interaction was also observed with an effect size of .02. Scheffe comparisons of the cell means revealed no significant differences, although friends who rated the conversation immediately indicated more satisfaction than all other conditions.

Research Question Three

This study was also directed at the creation of four context-based measures of communication satisfaction. A measure can never be said to be valid or reliable, rather one can only say that it is valid and reliable when used for a specific purpose in a specific context. Focusing respondents on social situations establishes the communication purpose for which these measures are applicable. The intimacy of the relationship and the time frame of measurement are two of the contexts within which measurement can proceed. The previous data analyses indicated important differences between these contexts. Accordingly, measures must be created for use within each measurement milieu.

Four context-specific measures of interpersonal communication satisfaction were created by combining the results of the multiple discriminant analyses with item analysis procedures. Item analyses, which were conducted separately in the four contexts (friends, acquaintances, immediate and recalled rating), consisted of dividing respondents into the top and bottom quartile based on their total scores on all 60 items. For each item in each context the difference between the mean of the quartiles was derived. The standard deviation within each quartile was also calculated for each item.

Criteria were prioritized for determining which of the 60 items would constitute the four context-specific measures. As a general measure of interpersonal communication satisfaction already exists for use across these contexts,[55] the main purpose of the present construction techniques was to establish measures sensitive to contextual differences. Accordingly, the results of the multiple discriminant analyses were given the greatest weight.

Three sets of items were included in the measures. The first set consisted of those items which achieved a weight of at least one-half the largest discriminant function coefficient and an item analysis difference score of 1.5. That is, items which could discriminate contextual differences were included if they proved capable of minimally differentiating highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied interactants.

The second set consisted of the other items which were entered into the discriminant-analysis prediction equation. These items were included if they also exhibited a rounded difference score of 2.0 or greater and had a rounded low group mean no greater than 5.0 (7 = highly satisfied). This procedure insured that these items could differentiate highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied respondents, would measure dissatisfaction, and could contribute to the investigation of contextual differences.

A third set of items were included which exhibited a difference score of at least 2.5 and had a low group mean of 5.0 or less. These items were powerful differentiators of highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied interactants.

Finally, items were eliminated if they were in the second or third set and had a bottom quartile standard deviation greater than 2.0 (rounded). This insured that items could clearly identify dissatisfied respondents thereby increasing overall variability and leading to a more reliable measure. A previous study of communication satisfaction had indicated that the scores of dissatisfied interactants were more crucial to valid and reliable measurement.[56] Accordingly, items were excluded which either did not tap dissatisfaction to any degree (low group mean above 5.0) or exhibited a high standard for this group.

The items chosen for the four context-specific measures of interpersonal communication satisfaction are included as Figure 1. Reliabilities for each inventory was calculated (coefficient alpha).[57] The reliability of the inventory for use with friends was .95. The reliability of the inventory for use with acquaintances was .97. Reliabilities of the inventories for use with immediate and recalled ratings were .86 and .96 respectively.

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

DISCUSSION

The results of this study demonstrate the role of context in assessing communication satisfaction, the viability of these items as satisfaction measures, and the conceptual power of communication satisfaction as a theoretical construct. Empirical support was found for the distinctions posed by the research questions.

The first research question addressed the influence of two contextual variables on the communication correlates of satisfaction. The discriminant power exhibited by the multiple discriminant analyses indicates that the correlates are influenced by the contextual variables under examination.

The first multiple discriminant analysis revealed that a relaxed atmosphere and signs of intimacy were more characteristic of the communication correlates of satisfaction when the other was considered a friend than when the other was considered an acquaintance. Communication satisfaction with acquaintances, conversely, is most influenced by control factors and the establishment of a common bond.

These findings are consistent with a developmental view of interpersonal communication[58] as well as intuitive notions of intimacy. People become friends because they are satisfied with the control or dominance aspects of their relationship. They have also established common bonds at this level of intimacy. What is important to satisfying communication with friends is the supportiveness they can provide. Further, people seem to look upon their interactions with firends as an opportunity to relax, letting down defenses. Interestingly, these results may indicate that acquaintances are viewed as potential friends, perhaps people who are at a certain level of intimacy in the process of intimacy build-up. An alternative explanation would posit the necessity to re-establish bonds and relational control for each contact with acquaintances.

The communication correlates of satisfaction were also found to vary with the time frame variable. Conversations which were rated immediately following their completion were more strongly influenced by adjustment factors: interaction management, smooth flow and perceived control over conversational development. That is, greater satisfaction was associated

with adjustment to each other when the conversation was rated after its occurrence than when conversations were recalled. Interaction management, especially conversational direction, is a crucial element of immediate feelings of communication satisfaction, and underlying the adjustment seems to be a control element. Not only is satisfaction influenced by the direction of the conversation, but who controls the direction as well. Recalled conversations, however, are marked by their emphasis on intentions and feelings of being understood.

The analyses, then, revealed important differences in the correlates of communication satisfaction depending on the time frame of measurement. Immediately following the conversation, satisfaction is determined by what happened during the conversation; the process itself. However, once time passes one's intention prior to the conversation and one's post-conversation feelings of having been understood emerge as the more important dimensions. It would seem that one faces a choice of which impression is more important: the immediate or long range one. Immediate satisfaction can be maximized by insuring that the conversation flows smoothly and that others perceive they have exercised control over the conversational development. More lasting impressions are determined by the intentions brought into the conversation and assurances that one has been understood. It is not clear whether these reflect perceptions at the time of the conversation or are tempered by post-conversation reflection. Future research will have to address the time frame question more directly to determine at what point in time the dimensionality changes as well as assessing for immediate conversations the nature of the control process.

These findings have important implications for investigations of relational communication, interaction styles and communication effectiveness or

competence. Typically, studies in these areas have asked respondents to recall another and rate their communication behavior. The results of this research reveal only the dimensionality associated with recalled conversations. The results of the present investigation indicate that greater attention must be paid to the study of conversations as they occur.

In addition to examining differences in the correlates of communication satisfaction, this study investigated the influence of intimacy and time frame variables on total satisfaction. The results of the analysis of variance indicate that while relationship intimacy and time frame explained a great deal of the variance in the discriminant space associated with communication correlates, they explained less of the variance in total satisfaction. Theoretically, this finding makes a great deal of sense. Discriminations, here contextual cues, influence communication behaviors. Outcomes, however, are derived most directly from the success of the behaviors.

The third and final research goal was the construction of context-specific measures of interpersonal communication satisfaction. The explication of a conceptual definition and measuring instrument provide the first steps toward understanding the intricacies of communication satisfaction. The conceptual and descriptive foundations, however, are not fully specified until one derives further knowledge of the parameters of the variable. Conceptually, the transactional perspective implies that communication research must be context-bound, and descriptively, sound measurement must be made context-specific.

The measures created exhibit high degrees of internal consistency reliability (between .86 and .97) for this sample.. Construct validity may be argued from a number of sources. First, item construction procedures

insured that the items differentiate between satisfying and dissatisfying conversations. Second, the measures were constructed within specific contexts and the items exhibited the ability to discriminate those contexts, account for up to 50% of the context variance. Third, the items proved capable of detecting significant between group differences (ANOVA results). They exhibited such capabilities even when minimal levels of variance were explained (e.g., the time frame by intimacy interaction). Future research should extend the analysis to address questions of convergent and discriminant validity.

These results reaffirm the importance of contextual variables for the study of interpersonal communication. The communication correlates of satisfaction were found to vary with the intimacy of the relationship and the time frame of measurement. The analysis of variance indicates that overall satisfaction is also influenced by these contextual variables. Significantly, comparison of the multiple discriminant analyses and the analysis of variance indicates that contextual variables have greater impact on the correlates of satisfaction than on total satisfaction. Other variables, such as relationship-type, dominance, relationship length and conversational goals, should be considered as contextual variables of some import. Theories of interpersonal communication must incorporate contextual elements; empirical investigations of interpersonal communication must include contextual variables in their designs; measures of communication constructs must be made context-specific. Context variables, however, do not appear to be appropriate for input-output designs. Rather, context seems to affect processes, which influence outcomes.

The magnitude of the relationshp between communication satisfaction and contextual variables is indicative of the importance of satisfaction

as a communication construct. Satisfaction provides an outcome measure of communication effects. More importantly it provides one criterion for assessing communication competence. Future research should attempt to utilize satisfaction as a criterion while assessing its relationship to other criteria such as attitude change, comprehension, and relational development.

TABLE 1

ROUNDED STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS
RELATIONSHIP INTIMACY DATA

Variable*	Function 1
2	.21
3	.12
5	.22
6	-.41
10	-.15
12	-.15
17	-.15
18	-.14
22	.36
23	-.35
26	-.20
27	.32
28	.26
34	.23
40	-.20
41	-.31
42	.20
43	.39
47	.35
51	-.19
53	.16
54	-.38
55	-.32
56	.20
57	-.36
60	.25

*Variable numbers coded to Figure 1

TABLE 2

ROUNDED STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS
TIME FRAME DATA

Variable*	Function 1
5	-.20
9	-.29
10	.19
11	.14
16	.14
17	.12
19	-.20
24	-.10
25	.16
28	-.12
30	-.20
32	-.19
33	.16
39	-.22
43	-.23
45	-.14
50	.17
54	.19
57	.33
58	-.15
59	-.22

*Variable numbers coded to Figure 1

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	df	MS	F	p	Effect Size
Time Frame	1	136576.75	54.53	.001	.11
Intimacy	1	76432.04	30.52	.001	.20
Time Frame X Intimacy	1	14035.24	5.60	.018	.02
Error	204	2504.43			

FIGURE 1

Checklist of Items in Context-Specific Inventories

Item	Friend	Acquaintance	Immediate Rating	Recalled Rating
1. The other person let me know that I was communicating effectively.				
2. All the other person did was answer yes or no.				
3. The other person did not want to talk with me.				
4. Nothing was accomplished.		X		
5. The other person's responses often seemed unrelated to what I had been saying.		X		X
6. The other person pretended to listen to me but was NOT really listening.	X	X		X
7. I provided the other person with some useful information about a topic she/he cared about.				
8. I purposely said things I did NOT mean to mislead the other person.				
9. The other person enabled me to learn a lot about her/him.			X	X
10. I really wanted to understand what the other person meant.			X	X
11. Nobody monopolized the conversation.	X			X
12. I genuinely wanted to know the other person.		X		
13. I would like to have another conversation like this one.	X	X	X	X
14. We competed with each other.		X		X
15. The other person genuinely wanted to get to know me.		X		X
16. The other person enjoyed my uses of humor.				X
17. When I had something to say the other person let me say it.	X			X
18. The topic was intellectually challenging.		X		

Figure 1...continued

Item	Friend	Acquaintance	Immediate Rating	Recalled Rating
19. I was very dissatisfied with the conversation.	X	X	X	X
20. I had something else to do.				
21. The other person wanted me to say something I did NOT want to say.				
22. I felt that during the conversation I was able to present myself as I wanted the other person to view me.	X	X		X
23. I was physically comfortable during the conversation.	X	X		
24. The other person talked about herself/himself all the time.				
25. The other person showed me that he/she understood what I said.	X	X	X	X
26. The other person put herself/himself on a higher level and looked down on me.		X		X
27. I was very satisfied with the conversation.	X	X	X	X
28. The other person continued the conversation after I wanted to stop.	X	X		
29. The other person expressed a lot of interest in what I had to say.	X	X		X
30. The other person kept making an issue of of something I did not want to talk about.	X			X
31. I was able to know what the other person meant without him/her completely saying it.				
32. The other person showed approval of what I had to say.	X	X	X	X
33. The other person knew what I meant with my completly saying it.				X
34. We talked about situations we are both involved in.	X			
35. I did NOT enjoy the conversation.	X	X		X

Figure 1...continued

Item	Friend	Acquaintance	Immediate Rating	Recalled Rating
36. I helped the other person feel better.				X
37. The other person did NOT provide support for what she/he was saying.	X	X		X
38. I felt I could talk about anything with the other person.		X	X	
39. The other person did NOT take into account my point of view.	X	X	X	X
40. We each got to say what we wanted.	X	X		X
41. I felt that we could laugh easily together.	X	X		X
42. The conversation was NOT pleasant.	X	X		X
43. The other person frequently interrupted me while I was talking.	X	X		X
44. In speaking I seemed very nervous.				
45. Frequently my words did NOT come out the way I intended.				X
46. I learned something new.				
47. I tried to find out more from the other person about what he/she was saying.	X	X		
48. The other person used language which offended me.				
49. The other person tried to make me feel better	X			X
50. The conversation flowed smoothly.	X	X	X	X
51. The other person's words did NOT seem to fit with the way she/he presented it.	X	X		X
52. The other person changed the topic when his/her feelings were brought into the conversation.				
53. The other person frequenlty said things which added little to the conversation.		X		X
54. The other person told me those things which he/she liked about me which I also like.	X			X

Figure 1...continued

Item	Friend	Acquaintance	Immediate Rating	Recalled Rating
55. We talked about something I was NOT interested in.	X	X		
56. The other person put words in my mouth when I was trying to explain something.		X		X
57. I was forced to speak to the other person.		X	X	X
58. The other person did NOT look at me while we talked.				
59. The other person was able to adjust to me in the situation.	X	X		X
60. The other person would not tell me what they were thinking or feeling.	X	X		
Total number of Items in Inventory	29	34	11	36

FOOTNOTES

[1]John P. Wanous, "A Causal-Correlational Analysis of the Job Satisfaction and Performance Relationship," Journal of Applied Psychology, 59 (1974), 139-144.

[2]Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

[3]James C. McCroskey, "Oral Communication Apprehension: A Summary of Recent Theory and Research," Human Communication Research, 4 (1977), 78-96.

[4]Donn Byrne, The Attraction Paradigm (N.Y.: Academic Press, 1971).

[5]See, for example, Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality (N.Y.: Harper, 1954); Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961).

[6]John W. Thibaut and Harold H. Kelley, The Social Psychology of Groups (New York: Wiley, 1959).

[7]John P. Garrison, Daniel L. Sullivan, and Larry E. Pate, "Interpersonal Valence Dimensions as Discriminators of Communication Contexts: An Empirical Assessment of Dyadic Linkages," a paper presented at the convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, Dec., 1976.

[8]Malcolm R. Parks, "Issues in the Explication of Communication Competence," a paper presented at the meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Phoenix, 1977.

[9]Michael L. Hecht, "The Conceptualization and Measurement of Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction," Human Communication Research, 4 (1978), 253-64.

[10]Michael L. Hecht, "Toward a Conceptualization of Communication Satisfaction," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64 (1978), 47-62.

[11]Donald Meichenbaum, Cognitive-Behavior Modification (N.Y.: Plenum Press, 1977).

[12]Gerald R. Miller and Mark Steinberg, Between People: A New Analysis of Interpersonal Communication (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975), 22-25.

[13]See, for example, Frederick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner, and Barbara Bloch Snyderman, The Motivation to Work, 2nd ed. (N.Y.: Wiley, 1959); Paul Watzlawick, Janet Helmick Beavin, and Don D. Jackson, Pragmatics of Human Communication (New York: W. W. Norton, 1967); Charles R. Berger and Richard J. Calabrese, "Some Explorations in Initial Interaction and Beyond: Toward a Developmental Theory of Interpersonal Communication," Human Communication Research, 1 (1975), 99-112.

[14]B. F. Skinner, Science and Human Behavior (New York: Free Press, 1953).

[15]Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson.

[16]Jesse G. Delia, "Alternative Perspectives for the Study of Human Communication: Critique and Response," Communication Quarterly, 25 (1977), 46-62.

[17]Roderick P. Hart and Donald M. Burks, "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction," Speech Monographs, 39 (1972), 75-91; Roderick P. Hart, William F. Eadie and Robert E. Carlson, "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Communication Competence," a paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Houston, 1975.

[18]Michael Argyle, Social Interaction (Chicago: Aldine, 1969).

[19]Arthur P. Bochner and Clifford W. Kelly, "Interpersonal Competence: Rationale, Philosophy and Implementation of a Conceptual Framework," Speech Teacher, 23 (1974), 279-301.

[20]Elaine Litton-Hawes, "A Foundation for the Study of Everyday Talk," Communication Quarterly, 25 (1977), 2-11.

[21]Art Bochner, "On Taking Ourselves Seriously: An Analysis of Some Persistant Problems and Promising Directions in Interpersonal Research," Human Communication Research, 4 (1978), p. 183.

[22]Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson, p. 132.

[23]Robert L. Heath, "Variability in Value System Priorities as Decision-Making Adaptation to Situational Differences," Communication Monographs, 43 (1976), 325-333.

[24]Rebecca Boring Rubin, "The Role of Context in Information Seeking and Impression Formation," Communication Monographs, 44(1977), 81-90.

[25]Jesse G. Delia, Walter H. Crockett, Alan H. Press and Daniel J. O'Keefe, "The Dependence of Interpersonal Evaluations on Context-Relevant Beliefs About the Other," Speech Monographs, 42 (1975), 10-19.

[26]James E. Norwig, "An Alternate Approach to Context of Interpersonal Evaluation," a paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, Dec., 1976.

[27]Gerald Miller, Frank Boster, Michael Roloff and David Seibold, "Compliance-Gaining Message Strategies: A Typology and Some Findings Concerning Effects of Situational Differences," Communication Monographs, 44 (1977), 37-51; Gail Sorenson and James C. McCroskey, "The Prediction of Interaction Behavior in Small Groups: Zero History Versus Intact Groups," Communication Monographs, 44 (1977), 73-80; Bochner, "On Taking Ourselves Seriously," pp. 184-5.

[28]Bochner, "On Taking Ourselves Seriously."

[29]Bochner, "On Taking Ourselves Seriously," p. 184.

[30]Bochner, "On Taking Ourselves Seriously."

[31]W. Barnett Pearce, "Consensual Rules in Interpersonal Communication: A Reply to Cushman and Whiting," Journal of Communication, 23 (1973), 160-168.

[32]George J. Keiser and Irwin Altman, "Relationship of Nonverbal Behavior to the Social Penetration Process," Human Communication Research, 2 (1976), 147-161.

[33]Gerald M. Phillips, "Rhetoric and its Alternatives as Bases for Examination of Intimate Communication," Communication Quarterly, 24 (1976), 11-23.

[34]Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson.

[35]Garrison, Sullivan, and Pate, "Interpersonal Valence Dimensions."

[36]Rogers; Evelyn Sieburg and Carl Larson, "Dimensions of Interpersonal Response," a paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Phoenix, April, 1971; Charles M. Rossiter, Jr. and W. Barnett Pearce, Communicating Personally: A Theory of Interpersonal Communication and Human Relationships (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1975).

[37]See, for example, Marvin Karlins and Herbert J. Abelson, How Opinions and Attitudes Are Changed, 2nd ed. (N.Y.: Springer Publishing Co., 1970), 27-29.

[38]Robert J. House and Lawrence A. Wigdor, "Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism," Personnel Psychology, 20 (1967), 369-389.

[39]Frederick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner and Barbara Bloch Snyderman, The Motivation to Work, 2nd ed. (New York: Wiley, 1959).

[40]George B. Graen, "Motivator and Hygiene Dimensions for Research and Development Engineers," Journal of Applied Psychology, 50 (1966), 563-566; John R. Hinrichs and Louis A. Mischkind, "Empirical and Theoretical Limitations of the Two-Factor Hypothesis of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51 (1967), 191-200.

[41]Hecht, "The Conceptualization and Measurement of Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction."

[42]Michael L. Hecht, "Measures of Communication Satisfaction," Human Communication Research, in press.

[43]Paul McHugh, Defining the Situation: The Organization of Meaning in Social Interaction (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968).

[44]Hecht, "The Conceptualization and Measurement of Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction."

[45]Hecht, "Toward a Conceptualization of Communication Satisfaction."

[46]Hecht, "Measures of Communication Satisfaction."

[47]Hecht, "Toward a Conceptualization of Communication Satisfaction."

[48]Maury Davis, Intimate Relations (N.Y.: Free Press, 1963), p. xvii.

[49]William T. Page and Margaret McLaughlin, "Multiple Discriminant Analysis: A Neglected Technique in Speech Communication Research," a paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, December, 1972, pp. 4-5.

[50]Maurice M. Tatsuoka, Discriminant Analysis: The Study of Group Differences, (Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970), pp. 1-5.

[51]Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner and Dale H. Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), pp. 434-467.

[52]Tatsuoka, p. 38.

[53]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[54]Nie, et al., pp. 398-433.

[55]Hecht, "The Conceptualization and Measurement of Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction."

[56]Michael L. Hecht, "The Conceptualization and Measurement of Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction," an unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1976.

[57]Jum C. Nunnally, Psychmetric Theory (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), pp. 193-196.

[58]Berger and Calabrese; Irwin Altman and Dalmas A. Taylor, Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships (N.Y.: Holt, 1973).